Business of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The House will now rise. But before the House rises, I will announce the business for tomorrow. The Appropriation Bill will be taken up tomorrow and if it is finished, we will go to the non-official business.

Hon'ble Members wanted to know the scope of the Appropriation Bill. I will give it tomorrow. In the meanwhile, I will read a portion of the Rules of the Lok Sabha for the information of the Members:

"237 (4): The debate on an Appropriation Bill shall be restricted to matters of public importance or administrative policy implied in the grants covered by the Bill which have not already been raised while the relevant demands for grants were under consideration.

(5) The Speaker may, in order to avoid repetition of debate, require members desiring to take part in discussion on an Appropriation Bill to give advance intimation of the specific points they intend to raise, and he may withhold permission for raising such of the points as in his opinion appear to be repetitions of the matters discussed on a demand for grant or as may not be of sufficient public importance".

That is the Rule in the Lok Sabha. The general rule is that the debate on the Appropriation Bill is very much limited. Hon'ble Members will please see that they are very brief in their remarks.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM (Jagalur).—May I submit our own Rules, Sir?

"130 (1): Subject to the provisions of the Constitution, the procedure in regard to an Appropriation Bill shall be the same as for Bills generally with such modifications as the Speaker may consider necessary.

(2) At any time after the introduction in the Assembly of an Appropriation Bill, the Speaker may allot a day or days jointly or severally for the completion of all or any of the stages involved in the passage of the Bill by the Assembly, and when such allotment has been made the Speaker shall at five o'clock on the allotted day or, as the case may be, the last of the allotted days, forthwith put every question necessary to dispose of all the outstanding matters in connection with the stage or stages for which the day or days have been allotted".

That is the procedure to be adopted under our Rules. The previous practice in this House was also to allot one day for the Appropriation Bill. It is also permissible for the Speaker to allot more than one day. I submit that we are not concerned with the Lok Sabha Rules. We are concerned with our own Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business. Under these Rules, at least one day has to be allotted for the consideration of the Appropriation Bill and that has been done till now. No other business was being transacted on the day allotted to the Appropriation Bill. So, I submit humbly that for the Appropriation Bill, one full day may be set apart as contemplated by the Rules relating to this Assembly. For non-official business, I think one full day has to be set apart because that is a matter on which individual members have to place their views before the Government. I submit that the privileges should not be curtailed for non-official resolutions. The practice all along has been to set apart one full day. I therefore request that one full day may be set apart. I am sure the new Leader of the House is always accommodative and I therefore appeal to him and to you, Sir, that the usual privilege of this House should not be curtailed. I submit that the practice should prevail and one full day should be allotted for the Appropriation Bill and one full day for non-official business.

I have just now given notice of a motion seeking the permission of the

Chair to move a motion to discuss the Vidhana Soudha Enquiry Committee Report which has evoked so much of criticism in this House and outside. I want to submit that till now the discussion on the Report was confined to the Government and the ex-Chief Minister. Several members of the present House who were members of the former Mysore State Assembly are also intimately connected with this question. In my opinion, all those who voted for that demand were responsible for the construction of the building. Now that they are members of the present Assembly also, after the completion of this building, I think it is but fair that we should give an opportunity to those members to express their opinion on this Vidhana Soudha which has been agitating the minds of the people. That is why I have tabled this motion. Under rule 115, the condition laid down for admission of such a motion is that it must cover a subject matter of public importance. The special permission of the Chair is required for moving such a motion. As this is a matter of very great public importance, I would request you, Sir, to give your permission for moving the same.

Mr. SPEAKER.—What about the consent of the Leader of the House?

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—His consent is not required under the rules. Only the Speaker's consent is required. I shall read the relevant rule 115:

> "Save in so far as is otherwise provided by the Constitution or by these rules, no discussion of a matter of general public interest shall take place otherwise than on a resolution moved in accordance with the rules governing the moving of resolutions, except on a motion made with the consent of the Speaker, who, if he admits the motion will allot a day or days for its discussion in consultation with the Leader of the House".

So, Sir, the consent of the Leader of the House is not required. Government is an interested party in all such matters.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Do you mean to say that I can allot a day in spite of the Leader of the House saying 'no' to it?

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—As Government is always an interested party, we always look to the Chair which is disinterested in such things. This is a very important matter with which the present House has been dealing for the last 4 years. We are also equally responsible for this huge expenditure which is called extravagant. So it is only fair that this matter should be discussed by this House so that those Members who had voted for the various items of expenditure and who were responsible for this building, may express their views. Secondly, Sir, this is a matter of general public interest and so it is but right that this House should be given an opportunity to discuss this matter. Otherwise we would be failing in our duty and the people would misunderstand us and think that we have evaded our responsibility. So, on these grounds, I appeal to the Chair to admit this motion and allot time for its disscussion. In this case, time is not a matter for consideration; it is the importance of the subject that is paramount.

Sri H. K. VEERANNA GOWDH (Minister for Public works).—Sir, with reference to the observation made by the Leader of the Opposition about the responsibility of the old Assembly in voting the demands for the Vidhana Soudha, I may submit a few figures for the consideration of the House:

ಈ ಪ್ರೋಟ್ ಅಕೌಂಟಿನ ಸಂಬಂಧದಲ್ಲಿ ಚರ್ಚೆಗೆ ಅನುಕೂಲವಾಗುವಂತೆ ಈ ಕೆಳಗಿನ ಸ್ಟೇಟ್‌ಮೆಂಟನ್ನು ಓದಿ ತಮ್ಮ ಗಮನಕ್ಕೆ ತರುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇನೆ.

STATEMENT SHOWING THE DETAILS OF EXPENDITURE ON VIDHANA SOUDHA BUILDINGS.

Year	Budget Provision	Amount spent
1952–53*...	4,00,000	4,00,389
1953–54 ...	10,00,000	12,09,523
1954–55 ...	25,00,000	31,69,524
1955–56 ...	55,00,000	52,83,992

* Provision under "50 Civil Works" Vol. I was surrendered and additional grant obtained under "81 Capital Account of Civil Works outside the Revenue Account".

*Sri S. NIJALINGAPPA (Chief Minister).—As regards the contention of my Hon'ble friend that this House should have one full day for discussion of the Report, I do not think it is necessary. Certain points contained in the Report have already been discussed by the House. Further, I may submit to the Chair that Government have ordered further departmental enquiries to be instituted in this case. Government will have to decide upon the evidence that may be forthcoming. So it is not proper for this House at this stage to go into the merits of the Report. It is, therefore, not necessary to allot a day for it. A detailed discussion on this indirectly went on for the last three or four days in this House. Further, I submit that there is no time available for discussion tomorrow.

As regards tomorrow's business, I do not think the Appropriation Bill will take much time. Usually, it does not take more than 15 to 20 minutes. So, after the Appropriation Bill is disposed of, the rest of the day may be devoted for non-official business.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—My submission is that till now the discussion on the Report was confined to the ex-Chief Minister and some members connected with Government and the other members did not have a chance to express their opinion on it.

Sri S. NIJALINGAPPA.—In fact, Sir, it is on the Hon'ble Member's mention of it in his speech that the whole matter arose.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—If the Chief Minister says that the matter is *sub judice*, I think the Government has done the worst damage to the whole case. The whole matter was discussed threadbare by the ex-Chief Minister and the Government Members in the House. Now if the Chief Minister comes with the plea that the matter is *sub judice* and the House should not discuss it at this stage, then I think it is very unfair to the House.

Sri S. NIJALINGAPPA.—I do not say it is *sub judice*; I only said that there were certain departmental enquiries which were going to be held and there were certain other matters also which were outside the scope of the enquiry that was conducted by the Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER.—So far as the question of allotting one more day for discussion of the Report of the Vidhana Soudha Enquiry Committee is concerned, I am told by the Leader of the Opposition that he has sent notice of a motion for the purpose. I will deal with the matter as I think best. Since notice of a motion has been given to me, I will have to decide about it and inform the House about allotting one day for discussion.

So far as the Appropriation Bill is concerned, as I have already told the House, the scope of discussion is very much limited. The Leader of the Opposition tells me that usually a day used to be allotted for this purpose in the old Mysore Assembly, but I may say that I have the power to curtail the time because this is not an Appropriation Bill on the whole Budget for the full year, but it is only an Appropriation Bill on account for four months. So the scope of discussion is still more limited. Therefore I do not want to give more time for discussiond because these amounts are sanctione, only as an advance. As this House would be sitting for the last time, I thought it better to give the House some more time so that most of the outgoing members would have an opportunity of speaking on financial matters. That is why I gave more time for discussion of the demands for grants. That being so, I do not see any reason why Hon'ble Members should now want more time to discuss matters pertaining to the Appropriation Bill. Even then, I do not desire to curtail the debate on the Appropriation Bill, but I may have to stop members from offering remarks on matters which have been fully discussed by the House during the last four days. We spent about 18 hours on discussion of the

financial matters here. That, I think, should suffice. If, however, new matters are raised on the Appropriation Bill, certainly time would be given for that.

So far as non-official business is concerned, I would like to give a full day, that is, 4½ hours or 5 hours. I think that, if we can finish the Appropriation Bill tomorrow within one hour and also sit in the evening, then we would be able to give full time, that is, 5 hours, for non official business.

I do not think that we can sit for one day more so far as Non-official Business is concerned. So far as the notice of the motion of the Leader of the Opposition is concerned, I will give my ruling tomorrow.

The House now rises and will meet tomorrow at 8-30 A.M.

The House adjourned at Thirty-two Minutes past Five of the Clock to meet at Thirty Minutes past Eight of the Clock on Wednesday, 27th March 1957.

WD 2373—GPB—900—1-6-57